



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,245	08/21/2002	Toshihiro Sadaoka	50069-11	4541

20277 7590 06/15/2004

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP  
600 13TH STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

CHOI, FRANK I

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1616

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/089,245		SADAOKA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Frank I Choi		1616	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 August 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☒ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Priority*

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Japan on 08/02/2000. It is noted, however, that the IFW file does not appear to have a copy of the certified copy of JAPAN 2000-234908 08/02/2000. Examiner has requested said copy from the International Bureau.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) because the applicant did not invent the claimed subject matter. JP 2002330820 expressly discloses a sebum absorbing paper containing 10% hydroxyapatite and 10% talc, each with particle size of 3 microns, having a basis weight of 15 g/m<sup>2</sup> (See Table 2).

Claim 1 is also provisionally rejected under 35 USC 102(f) over JP2003038248 as it appears to expressly disclose a sebum absorbing paper containing 15 or 30 or 10% hydroxyapatite having a basis weight of 20, 20, and 5 g/m<sup>2</sup>, respectively. (See Table 1).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1616

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 393 723 in view of JP 11-137336, and JP 63188628 or JP 63027411.

EP 0 393 723 teaches a paper containing hydroxyapatite and talc, where the paper preferably has a basis weight of 20 g/m<sup>2</sup>, which is used as deodorants and absorbants (pgs. 5-10).

JP 11-137336 teaches a paper used to absorb oil from the skin containing talc.

JP 63188628 or JP 63027411 disclose that hydroxyapatite is used in cosmetic product to absorb oxidized lipids (Abstract).

The difference between the prior art and the claimed invention is that the prior art does not expressly disclose a sebum absorbing paper used for applying to skin or for cleaning skin which contains 1-30% by weight hydroxyapatite and has a basis weight of 5 to 25 g/m<sup>2</sup> as defined in JIS P-8124. However, the prior art amply suggests the same as it is known in the art to use papers containing hydroxyapatite and talc as absorbants, papers containing talc are known to be used for absorbing oil from the skin and that hydroxyapatite is used in cosmetic products to absorb oxidized lipids. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the prior art as above with the expectation that a paper containing hydroxyapatite and talc would be suitable for absorbing oxidized sebum from the skin.

Examiner had duly considered Applicant's arguments but deems them moot in light of the new grounds of rejection herein. To the extent Applicant's arguments are applicable, the following apply.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on

Art Unit: 1616

combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Further, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Contrary to Applicant's arguments, the prior art as indicated above does disclose that hydroxyapatite absorbs oxidized lipids. Further, EP'723 discloses that hydroxyapatite is preferably used in an amount of 50% by weight or more (Pg. 10, lines 25-36).

Therefore, the claimed invention, as a whole, would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, because every element of the invention has been collectively taught by the combined teachings of the references.

### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

A facsimile center has been established in Technology Center 1600. The hours of operation are Monday through Friday, 8:45 AM to 4:45 PM. The telecopier number for accessing the facsimile machine is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frank Choi whose telephone number is (571)272-0610. Examiner maintains a flexible schedule. However, Examiner may generally be reached Monday-Friday, 8:00 am – 5:30 pm (EST), except the first Friday of the each biweek which is Examiner's normally scheduled day off.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Mr. Thurman Page, can be reached at (571)272-0602. Additionally, Technology Center 1600's Receptionist and Customer Service can be reached at (571) 272-1600.

FIC June 12, 2004

  
NEIL S. LEVY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER